



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/556,982	04/24/2000	William Vong	3797.875	6962

28319 7590 09/26/2003

BANNER & WITCOFF LTD.,  
ATTORNEYS FOR MICROSOFT  
1001 G STREET, N.W.  
ELEVENTH STREET  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4597

EXAMINER

ABDULSELAM, ABBAS I

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/556,982

Applicant(s)

VONG ET AL.

Examiner

Abbas I Abduselam

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-11,15-24,26,28-32 and 36-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-11,15-24,28-32 and 36-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 15-19 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dawson (USPN 5727155).

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Dawson teaches a multi-computer system including a host system (200) having a visual display device (205) and a remote system (220) having its own visual display device (225). Dawson teaches that both the host system (200) and the remote system (220) are controlled by the host system (200) itself and the two systems are interconnected by a connection line (240). Dawson discloses a host system (200) and remote system (220) each with their respective CPUs (305, 310) driving their respective applications. Further, Dawson's Fig. 2 shows that the two systems (200, 220) have their respective data entry devices. Dawson teaches that the visual display device (205) of the host system (200) provides visual display (208), which is representation of information displayed by the host system (200). Dawson also teaches that the remote system (220) may also be executing multiple local applications, which are displayed on a visual display (230), and the display (230) is not part of the shared display. See col. 5, lines 5-60, col. 6, lines 58-61, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3.

Regarding claim 28, in addition to what has been described, Dawson illustrates a remote system's visual display device (225) as shown in Fig. 2. Inspection of Fig. 2 reveals the display

Art Unit: 2674

device (225) is standing by itself and hence it is “standalone unit”. The display (225) as shown on the Fig. 2 also shows N application and local applications displayed on its screen.

Regarding claim 2, Dawson teaches that a host system (200) and remote system (220) are integrated through a connection (240), which comprises a conventional telephone wire. See col. 5, lines 13-16.

Regarding claims 3 and 5, Dawson teaches a connection line (240) representing any of the wide variety of well-known communication media. See col. 5, lines 18-20.

Regarding claims 6 and 11, Dawson teaches a remote system (220) that may be executing multiple local applications, which are displayed on a visual display (230). See col. 6, lines 58-61 and Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 7, Dawson discloses that visual display devices (205, 225) can be any wide variety of conventional devices.

Regarding claim 8, Dawson teaches a display device (107) utilized as LCD. See col. 4, lines 32-37.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 29, Dawson teaches a remote system (220) including the use of any application. See col. 6, lines 63-66 ad Fig. 2 (230).

Regarding claim 15, Dawson discloses a host system (200) controlling both the host system (200) itself and a remote system (220). See col. 5, lines 27-37. Dawson also teaches that the flow of information from a host system to a remote system including the use of remote application (360) in a desired context. See Fig. 3.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claims 16-17, Dawson teaches that a host system (200) providing different levels of access to remote system (220) for consequent display on (225). See col. 8, lines 7-10, 44-45 and Fig. 2.

Regarding claim 18, Dawson discloses remote application (360) determining whether the display task can be performed directly by the GDI (365). See col. 10, lines 37-40 and Fig. 4b (450, 455, 465).

Regarding claims 19 and 30-32, Dawson teaches Dawson teaches access control (210) providing the user of a host system (200) with the ability to change the access level. See col. 7, lines 2-5.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20-24, 26 and 36-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Dawson (USPN 5727155).

Regarding claim 20, Dawson has been described above. However, Dawson does not specifically disclose determining the capacity of the second display information, and then sending the information about the capacity back and forth within the two displays. On the other hand, Dawson discloses the flow of information from a host system to a remote system and vice versa. For example, Dawson discloses sending data packet to remote system (440) and the

Art Unit: 2674

remote system is also to send signals back to host system (540). See Fig. 4a, Fig. 5 and col. 5, lines 48-50. Dawson further teaches that the host system (200) transfers the information indicating what remote system (220) is to display and the hence the host system controls the dimension of the display. Moreover, Dawson teaches that the visual display (205, 225) can be any wide variety of conventional display devices. See col. 5, lines 25-26 and col. 6 lines 25-40.

Therefore, it would have would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the option of obtaining a wide variety of display devices for the purpose of selecting an appropriate type. One would have been motivated in view of the suggestion that the wide variety includes the display unit with the desired capacity.

Regarding claim 36, Dawson discloses a computer system (119) in which a connecting device (11) is coupled with a bus for allowing the system to communicate with other computer systems over a larger network such as local area network (LAN). It would have been obvious the use of LAN involves a server. See col. 4, lines 22-32.

Regarding claim 47, Dawson discloses a connecting device (112), which may include a conventional modem (112) for connecting the computer system over a telephone line or other similar communication device. See col. 4, lines 28-31. It would have been obvious to make use of the modem only for remote system.

Regarding claim 54, Dawson teaches the use of applications shown on visual display device (205) such that the applications can be any of a wide variety of programs including graphic programs, spreadsheet programs and word processing programs and so on. It would have been obvious that the wide variety of applications can include the desires operating system.

Art Unit: 2674

Regarding claim 55, Dawson teaches a system (119) comprising a communication device (100) for communicating information and a processor (CPU) 101 coupled with bus for processing information and instructions. Dawson also teaches a computer system (119) including a read only memory (ROM) coupled with bus for storing static information and instructions from processor (101). See col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 6-10. It would have been obvious that instructions executed by the processor are from computer readable medium.

Regarding claim 22, Dawson teaches the access control block which is displayed outside the shared display (216) on remote system (220). See col. 7, lines 51-54.

Regarding claims 23-24, Dawson teaches the use of a wide variety of conventional graphic programs, data base programs and others. See col. 6, lines 62-67.

Regarding claims 21 and 26, Dawson teaches that the host system (200) transfers information indicating what the remote system is to display and determine its capability. See col. 6, lines 25-40.

Regarding claim 37, Dawson teaches that the remote system (220) is executing multiple local applications that are displayed on a visual display (230). See col. 6, lines 58-61.

Regarding claims 38-39, Dawson discloses access control (210) providing the use of a host system (200) with the ability to change the access level. See col. 7, lines 2-5.

Regarding claims 40-42 and 49, Dawson teaches the use of various application including graphic and others. See col. 6, lines 63-67.

Regarding claims 43, 48 and 50-53, Dawson discloses a connecting device (112) with respect to a communication other computers over a large area network (LAN). See col. 4, lines

Art Unit: 2674

24-31. In addition D teaches the use of a wide variety of communication media. See col. 5, lines 15-20.

Regarding claims 44-46, Dawson teaches a host system and a remote system being connected by conventional modems and a connection line (240). See col. 5, lines 13-16.

Regarding claim 56, see Fig. 2 where display (225) is standing by itself along with data input device.

### **Conclusion**

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered to applicant's disclosure.

The following arts are cited for further reference.

U.S. Pat. No. 6,522,309 to Weber

U.S. Pat. No. 6,341,305 to Wolfe

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to **Abbas Abdulsalam** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-8591**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**



Art Unit: 2674

**(703) 872-9314**

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology center 2600 customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Abbas Abdulsalam

Examiner

Art Unit 2674

September, 16, 2003



SEP 16 2003  
U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, DC 20540